American Trail Lines, Ltd., et al v. Gulick (Maritime Subsidy Board) 411 F 2d. 696 (D.C. 1969).

* "We do not feel that appellee should be required to 'operate in a fishbowl,' but by the same token we do not feel that appellants should be required to operate in a darkroom. If the Maritime Subsidy Board did not want to expose its staff's memorandum to public scrutiny it should not have stated publicly in its April 11 ruling that its action was based upon that memorandum, giving no other reasons or basis for its action. When it chose this course of action 'as a matter of convenience' (Brief for Appellee at 9) the memorandum lost its intra-agency status and became a public record, one which must be disclosed to appellants. Thus we conclude that the Board's April 11 ruling clearly falls within the confines of 5 USC § 552 (a)(2)(A) and consequently it must be produced for public inspection."

FOI cases in D.C.

Cuneo v. McNamara - Civ. No. 1826-67 (DDC 1967)
Kovic v. Gardner 2008-67 (do)
Bandy v. Comm. Imm. + Nat. 2234-67 (do)
Tobacco Institute v. FTC 3035-67 (do)
Bristol Myers v. FTC 2905-67 do
Matonis vs. FDA 479-68 (DDC 1968)

Cases on Exemption 7

Barcelometa Shoe Corp v. Raymond J. Compton 271 F. Supp. 591 (D. Puerto Rico) 1967

Clermont Bros. Co., Inc v. NLRB, 282 F. Supp. 540 (N. D. Ga.) 1968